

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 76-82 are currently pending. Claims 76, 81, and 82 have been amended by the present amendment. The changes to the claims are supported by the originally filed specification and do not add new matter.¹

In the outstanding Office Action, the specification was objected to as containing an informality; Claim 82 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being narrative and indefinite; Claims 76 and 79-82 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,778,289 to Iwata in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,471,407 to Ferlitsch; and Claims 77 and 78 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwata in view of Ferlitsch and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0133656 to Butterworth et al. (hereinafter “Butterworth”).

SPECIFICATION OBJECTION

Regarding the objection to the specification, the specification has been amended, as required by the Office Action. Further, the specification has been amended to include a “CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS” section heading and to refer to all the foreign applications to which priority is claimed. Accordingly, the objection to the specification is believed to have been overcome.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

Regarding the rejection of Claim 82 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, Claim 82 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, “a setting information acquisition unit configured to, in response to the print request for the image data or the document stored in the storage

¹ See, e.g., Figures 23 and 24, and the discussion related thereto in the originally filed specification.

device of the document source apparatus from the information processing apparatus, cause the information processing apparatus to transmit to the document source apparatus a transmission request for print setting information to be used by the document source apparatus.” Accordingly, the rejection of Claim 82 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is believed to have been overcome.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Amended Claim 76 is directed to an image forming apparatus configured to serve as a document destination apparatus for receiving and printing first image data or a first document stored in another image forming apparatus, and to serve as a document source apparatus for transmitting second image data or a second document stored therein to the other image forming apparatus, the image forming apparatus comprising:

a communication unit configured to communicate with the other image forming apparatus connected via a network, the other image forming apparatus including a first printing unit that is configured to print the first image data or the first document;

a document reception unit configured to transmit a first transmission request for the first image data or the first document to the other image forming apparatus and to receive the first image data or the first document stored in the other image forming apparatus via the communication unit;

a second printing unit configured to print the first image data or the first document received from the other image forming apparatus via the document reception unit;

a print execution unit configured to use the second printing unit to print the first image data or the first document received from the other image forming apparatus via the document reception unit;

a document storage unit configured to store the second image data or the second document; and

a document management unit configured to, in response to receipt of a second transmission request for the second image data or the second document from the other image forming apparatus, transmit the second image data or the

second document stored therein to the other image forming apparatus via the communication unit.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 76 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the Office Action acknowledges that Iwata fails to disclose a document management unit of Claim 76. Rather, the Office Action cites Ferlitsch for such a teaching.²

Ferlitsch is directed to systems and methods for monitoring an imaging job using implicit address discovery. The Office Action apparently cites the Ferlitsch pure-to-pure printing for teaching the claimed “document management unit.”³

However, it is respectfully submitted that Ferlitsch fails to disclose an image forming apparatus including a second printing unit and a document management unit configured to, in response to receipt of a second transmission request for the second image data or the second document from the other image forming apparatus, transmit the second image data or the second document stored therein to the other image forming apparatus (including a first printing unit that is configured to print the first image data or the first document) via the communication unit. Rather, as cited in the Office Action, Ferlitsch simply discusses, with respect to peer-to-peer printing, a client computing device 902 despoils a print job directly to an imaging device 904, bypassing any print server, using its print subsystem 912. Ferlitsch further discusses that the imaging device 904 obtains the network address of the client computing device 902 from the transmission packets despoiled between the client computing device 902 and the imaging device 904, and sends job completion notifications directly to a job monitor 906 on the client computing device 902, via the extracted network address.⁴

That is, Ferlitsch simply discusses communicating a print job from a client computing device 902 to an imaging device 904. Ferlitsch does not disclose that the client computing device 902 and the imaging device 904 each ***include a printing unit that is configured to print image data or a document.*** Thus, no matter how the teachings of Iwata and Ferlitsch

² See Office Action dated April 28, 2010, page 5.

³ Id.

⁴ See Ferlitsch , column 12, lines 5-17.

are combined, the combination does not teach or suggest at least the document management unit of Claim 76.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 76 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably defines over any proper combination of Iwata and Ferlitsch.

Claims 80 and 81, while differing at least in scope, patentably define over Iwata and Ferlitsch, for reasons analogous to the reasons stated above with respect to patentability of Claim 76. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 80 and 81 (and dependent Claim 82) patentably define over any proper combination of Iwata and Ferlitsch.

Regarding the rejections of dependent Claims 77 and 78 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), it is respectfully submitted that Butterworth fails to remedy the deficiencies of Iwata and Ferlitsch, as discussed above. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that dependent Claims 77 and 78 patentably define over any proper combination of Iwata, Ferlitsch, and Butterworth.

CONCLUSION

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 76, 80, and 81 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably define over Iwata, Ferlitsch, and Butterworth.

Consequently, in view of the present amendments and in light of the above discussion, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/09)

4098825_1.DOC


James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648

Johnny Ma
Registration No. 59,976